

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/881,235	06/14/2001	Akira Enokihara	5077-000055	7554
27572	7590 11/17/2003		EXAM	INER
,	DICKEY & PIERCE,	TAKAOKA, DEAN O		
P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2817	<del></del>

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	09/881,235	ENOKIHARA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Dean O Takaoka	2817			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cov-r sh- et wi	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 ( after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	ION.  CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a region.  s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON y statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	02 October 2003.				
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□	This action is non-final.				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5)  Claim(s) 6-12 is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-5 and 13-16 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction.</li> </ul>					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Exact 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 April 2003 is/an Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the country The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	re: a) accepted or b) object to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan correction is required if the drawing(	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for form a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:  1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority docu		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents of the certified copies of the application from the International Experiments application from the International Experiments are a securification for a claim for document is made of a claim for document as since a specific reference was included in the since a specific reference was included in the foreign language of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Experiments application from the Internation from the Internati	iments have been received in Aperiority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). In a list of the certified copies not be been as a list of the certified copies not be been as a list of the specifical deprivation has been application as been been as priority under 35 U.S.C.	received in this National Stage received. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) ation or in an Application Data Sheet. een received. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific			
Attachment(s)					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-943)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No.</li> </ol>	48) 5) Notice of In	ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Iformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3 – 11, and 13 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishikawa et al. (US Patent No. 4,639,699) for reasons of record contained in the previous office action dated June 23, 2003.

#### Claims 1 and 13:

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include "<u>made of a dielectric ceramic</u> material".

It is the position of the Examiner that the amendment of claim 1 adds no patentable subject matter to the claim and remains anticipated by Nishikawa et al.

Nishikawa et al. shows the dielectric resonators such as shown in Fig. 15 and further disclosing resonant electromagnetic modes such as the TM mode (col. 11, line 2), thus the dielectric resonators inherently being ceramic where the term "ceramic" is well-known in the art as a generic label for a plurality of dielectric material compositions.

Claims 3 – 5 and 13 – 15:

Have not been amended and remain rejected by Nishikawa et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Application/Control Number: 09/881,235

Art Unit: 2817

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa et al. and El-Sharawy (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,467) for reasons of record contained in the office action dated July 16, 2002.

### Claim 2:

Has not been amended and remain rejected by Nishikawa et al. and El-Sharawy.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa et al. and Liang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,805,033) for reasons of record contained in the office action dated July 16, 2002.

## Claim 16:

Has not been amended and remain rejected by Nishikawa et al. and Liang et al.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6 – 12 are allowed.

#### Claim 6:

Nishikawa et al. does not show "the conductive foil sheet extends outwardly to the outer edge of the case, and is in electrical contact with the case body" where the conductive sheet is "sandwiched between the elastic layer and the case body".

#### Claim 12:

Reasons for allowable subject matter of claim 12 is discussed in the previous office action dated July 23, 2003.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 2, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

## Claims 1 and 13:

While the prior office action recited Nishikawa et al. using air, Nishikawa et al., shows a plurality of embodiments which comprise not only air but ceramic resonant components as well. In particular Fig. 15 shows a cavity that is substantially filled with dielectric material other than air such as ceramic, where the use of ceramic is acknowledged in the Applicant's arguments.

While the value of the specific dielectric constants is not recited by Nishikawa et al., it is well-known in the art that "ceramic" dielectric material is a generic term which may cover a wide range of permittivity ( $\epsilon$ o), permittivity also disclosed by Nishikawa et al. With respect to the discussion of temperature characteristics, the Examiner regards this discussion moot since characteristics with respect to temperature is not commensurate with what is being claimed.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2817

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dean O Takaoka whose telephone number is (703) 305-6242. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30a - 5:00p Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal can be reached on (703) 308-4909. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

dot

November 7, 2003